

**Wyckoff Point – Community Interest Group Meeting
May 6, 2014**

Introduction and Context

Ecology formed a 10-member Community Interest Group (CIG) that will be active and provide informal input during the Focused Feasibility Study (FFS) and Remedial Action Proposed Plan development process. We formed this Community Interest Group to help us prepare for the formal public comment period for the Point by:

- Keeping the community apprised of content and progress on the evaluation of remedial alternatives;
- Receiving informal input from the community during the FFS process, enabling the EPA/Ecology team to anticipate and consider community concerns, suggestions and interests in the alternatives analysis;
- Expediting the Remedial Action Proposed Plan and Record of Decision process by addressing community issues along the way, prior to the formal public comment period.

The third of four planned meetings for this group was held on May 6, 2014. This document provides a bulleted summary of the primary input and questions received from Community Interest Group members at the Community Interest Group meeting held on May 6, 2014. EPA and Ecology appreciate the feedback and discussion with the CIG and will consider this information as work continues on the FFS, and in preparation for the next CIG meeting.

The PowerPoint presentation used at the meeting (which includes the meeting agenda) has been saved separately and made available on the EPA project website.

Meeting Attendees:

CIG Members present:

- City of Bainbridge Island - Doug Shultze
- Student Conservation Corps of Sustainable Bainbridge - (b) (6)
- Citizen at large - (b) (6)
- Additional individuals who requested membership based on the listserve announcement
(b) (6), (b) (6), (b) (6)

Public:

- (b) (6)

Agency:

- WA Department of Ecology – Barry Rogowski, Chung Yee, Dawn Hooper
- USEPA – Howard Orlean, Debra Sherbina, Helen Bottcher, Peter Machaud
- Floyd|Snider on behalf of Ecology – Kate Snider

Meeting Agenda:

- Status update on site management
- Coordination between Site Units (upland and in-water)
- Status of Alternatives Evaluation

Primary Questions and Input Received from Community Interest Group and Audience

Status Update on Site Management

- What are the costs? \$400,000 for 15 months, then next biennium = \$1.5 Million
- What are the consequences of less operational time? How do you monitor for those consequences. Consider development of a written Risk Mitigation Strategy based on levels in lower aquifer, to make decision regarding need to restart.
- Coordinate with CIG for funding for next biennium – community could assist in asking the legislature to provide for the additional funding to fully cover the operations and maintenance costs.

Coordination between Site Units (Upland and In-Water)

- How is the offshore extent of the East Beach/North Shoal determined – why only to the 0 contour?
- Has the bathymetry stabilized? Is it possible to get an updated bathymetric map (2011 survey is on web as part of 5-year review)
- Is intent with sediment cap that there is long term attenuation? Answer is that caps provide permanent physical and chemical isolation.
- Is cap maintenance a long term operating cost that the State will assume? Yes. Caps must be maintained in perpetuity. EPA will do the planned cap repair in the North Harbor and then transfer to the state following repair. For non-groundwater remedies, remedies transfer to state approximately 1 year following construction.
- Interested in coordination between EPA and Department of Health regarding clam analysis. Are EPA and DOH determinations of shellfish risk coordinated? What is reason for DOH closure of Bay for shellfish harvest – bacteria or superfund site?
- It is still hard for the public to understand the boundaries of the contaminated portion of the beach. Painting a line on the wall will be helpful.
- Isn't it possible for the creosote from the North Shoal to migrate to the clean area of the West Beach? Recommend re-evaluation of the safety of swimming at the West Beach.

Status of Alternatives Evaluation

- Peak electrical demand will be included under implementability criteria, and cost evaluation.
- How much does “Community Acceptance” make a difference based on past projects?
- EPA should collaborate with Bainbridge Parks on design of cap to synch with park design. Need to coordinate with Parks comprehensive plan.
- Interested in water use – is water use a closed loop system?
- Does MTTD alternative use existing park space for laydown that is currently open to the public?
- Can ISS be constructed immediately adjacent to the sheetpile wall?
- Respect adjacency of memorial when planning MTTD access road.

- Clearly describe short term inconvenience vs. long term benefit. If people understand the long term benefit they may be acceptant of the short term inconvenience.
- Will “sheet pile enhancement” be inside or outside of the current wall?
- Opportunities to enhance Eagle Harbor Drive with bike lanes would be good. Think broadly about options.
- Consider public-private energy partnership – combined heat and power co-generation on site. Opportunity to export power to grid. PSE would likely pay for upgrade to power. Look at business side of this – should evaluate public private partnership for power before EPA conducts value engineering – look at economic value of power sales to grid as part of cost evaluation of alternatives. Greater opportunity to get funding with these economics. There are several good examples of these public/private partnerships occurring currently, including at UW. Eric can provide more detail.
- Opportunities for coordination with both City and PSE on road/bike lanes and power options.
- Will the Remedy Review Board meeting be open to the public? Frank would like to be able to observe.
- Propose moving summer EPA public meeting to occur in September. Provide notices on ferry and visible notices on site. Announce and plan formal public comment process then as well. Provide a single notice anticipating informal public meeting in September and formal public comment and hearing in Oct/Nov. Let people know as far in advance as possible.
- Consider asking Perry to discuss park planning and financing in September meeting as well.
- Consider whether there are opportunities to leverage cleanup design to support park development. Who leads and how and when will the park visioning occur?
- When releasing the proposed plan to public, CIG can help in advance with the plan for public messaging.